## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

## **AUGUSTA DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	)	
v.	)	CR 109-127
MORGAN CHASE WOODS	)	
	<del></del>	-

ORDER

After a careful, *de novo* review of the file, the Court concurs with the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, to which objections have been filed.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge is **ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court. Therefore, the motions to suppress filed by Defendant Woods are **DENIED**. (Doc. nos. 45, 66).

SO ORDERED this 20day of April, 2010, at Augusta, Georgia.

J. RANDAL HALLY UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Defendant titled his objections as "Objections to the Report and Recommendation and Appeal to the United States District Judge Regarding the Magistrate Judge's Denial of Defendant's Motion to Suppress, and Memorandum of Law." (Doc. no. 87). However, the Magistrate Judge did not deny Defendant's requests for suppression; rather he recommended that the motions to suppress be denied. Accordingly, there is nothing to "appeal" from the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Instead, as explained above, the Court has conducted its own *de novo* review of the file prior to making the conclusive ruling on the motions to suppress.